

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/288,377	08/10/94	JOHNSON	FG2

LM21/1208

GENE A. TABACHNICK, ESQ.
REED SMITH SHAW & MCCLAY
435 SIXTH AVENUE
PITTSBURGH PA 15219

EXAMINER

OH, J

ART UNIT
2761PAPER NUMBER
8

DATE MAILED:

12/08/97

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No. 08/288,577	Applicant(s) Johnson et al.
Examiner Junghoon Kenneth Oh	Group Art Unit 2411

Responsive to communication(s) filed on Oct 30, 1997

This action is **FINAL**.

Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

Claim(s) 1-78 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

Claim(s) 1-78 is/are rejected.

Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is approved disapproved.

The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

All Some* None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

received.

received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____

received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 4 and 7

Interview Summary, PTO-413

Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 2411

DETAILED ACTION***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over King, Jr. et al (hereinafter, King), in view of Dworkin and in further view of Geier et al.

With respect to claim 1, King discloses a system which facilitates the user in electronically ordering items from suppliers. More specifically, it discloses a teaching of maintaining a catalog database of data, which includes a Public Catalog and a Private Catalog (col. 3, lines 41-58). Although King does not disclose a teaching of entering product information that at least partially describes at least one item... Dworkin discloses a system which assists a user in locating and purchasing goods or services by inputting minimum desired specifications for the products or service (col. 2, line 11-18). It would have been obvious for one having an ordinary skill in the art to include the foregoing feature in Dworkin to provide services for broader range of customers because it would have been very difficult for the customers to know all the different brands in the market. Furthermore, King discloses a teaching of Requester which initiates the requisition by accessing the Public or Private Catalog to search for the item of interest. Although it discloses the

Art Unit: 2411

means for building a requisition, it does not explicitly discloses what data that the requisition includes. Geiger et al, however, discloses a teaching of using catalog number or partial catalog number for ordering goods or services (abs.) and King further discloses a feature of prefilling the required field of the requisition after the searching for the requests (col. 5, lines 42-46). The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art to use catalog number for identifying purposes because the numbers are neutral in terms of the product type that it provides the simplest way for identifying different products. As for the last limitation of the claim 1, King discloses a teaching of sending purchase order send electronically. Although it does not specifically discloses a means for generating a purchase order, the Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to include a means for generating a purchase order if it includes a means for sending the purchase order electronically.

With respect to claim 2, Geier et al discloses a teaching of using catalog number for searching specific products (col. 3, lines 59-63). It would have been obvious for one having an ordinary skill in the art to utilize the teaching of catalog number because it would have provided easier search and retrieval for the requested products.

With respect to claim 3, Geier et al discloses a teaching of accessing similar catalog number that the user inputs (col. 4, lines 29-38).

With respect to claim 4, the Examiner notes that the only difference between this claim and claim 1 is that this claim includes more than one item to be requested for requisition purposes. Geier discloses a teaching of inputting more than one request at a time (Fig.1). It would have

Art Unit: 2411

been obvious for one having an ordinary skill in the art to include a feature as disclosed in Geiger et al to enhance the customer satisfaction by providing a service that the customer does not have to restart the requisition process for each different items that they want. For the rest of the claim, the Examiner repeats that the rejection and reasoning as in claim 1.

With respect to claim 5, Geier et al discloses a teaching of using catalog number for searching specific products (col. 3, lines 59-63). It would have been obvious for one having an ordinary skill in the art to utilize the teaching of catalog number because it would have provided easier search and retrieval for the requested products.

With respect to claims 6 and 7, Geier et al discloses a teaching of accessing similar catalog number that the user inputs (col. 4, lines 29-38).

With respect to claim 8, King discloses a system which facilitates the user in electronically ordering items from suppliers. More specifically, it discloses a teaching of maintaining a catalog database of data, which includes a Public Catalog and a Private Catalog (col. 3, lines 41-58).

Although King does not disclose a teaching of entering product information that at least partially describes at least one item... Dworkin discloses a system which assists a user in locating and purchasing goods or services by inputting minimum desired specifications for the products or service (col. 2, line 11-18). It would have been obvious for one having an ordinary skill in the art to include the foregoing feature in Dworkin to provide services for broader range of customers because it would have been very difficult for the customers to know all the different brands in the market. Furthermore, King discloses a teaching of Requester which initiates the requisition by

Art Unit: 2411

accessing the Public or Private Catalog to search for the item of interest. Although it discloses the means for building a requisition, it does not explicitly discloses what data that the requisition includes. Geier et al, however, discloses a teaching of using catalog number or partial catalog number for ordering goods or services (abs.) and King further discloses a feature of prefilling the required field of the requisition after the searching for the requests (col. 5, lines 42-46). Geier further discloses a order list generated in Appendix IV in col 11 and 12. It would have been obvious for one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time of claimed invention was made to include a order list as a confirmation purpose. Geier discloses a teaching of an open P. O.'s option which enables a customer to build an order by entering in any desired customer purchase order number (col. 6, lines 7-11). As for the last limitation of the claim 1, King discloses a teaching of sending purchase order send electronically. Although it does not specifically discloses a means for generating a purchase order, the Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to include a means for generating a purchase order if it includes a means for sending the purchase order electronically.

With respect to claim 9, Geier et al discloses a teaching of using catalog number for searching specific products (col. 3, lines 59-63). It would have been obvious for one having an ordinary skill in the art to utilize the teaching of catalog number because it would have provided easier search and retrieval for the requested products.

With respect to claim 10, Geier et al discloses a teaching of accessing similar catalog number that the user inputs (col. 4, lines 29-38).

Art Unit: 2411

With respect to claim 11, the Examiner notes that this claim recites substantially same as claim 8 except that it limits the number of selected matching catalog items to "at least two." Although Dworkin does not explicitly disclose a specific number of matching items against the information, or minimum specification that the customer inputs, the Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious for one having an ordinary skill in the art to modify the feature in Dworkin to limit the minimum number of items since Dworkin discloses "the system then searches the database for 'all' products or services, within the selected category, which fulfill these minimum requirements." The motivation would have been to provide the customers with at least two items, so that the customers can have at least one to compare with. For the rest of the claim, the Examiner repeats that the rejection and reasoning as in claim 8.

With respect to claim 12, Geier et al discloses a teaching of using catalog number for searching specific products (col. 3, lines 59-63). It would have been obvious for one having an ordinary skill in the art to utilize the teaching of catalog number because it would have provided easier search and retrieval for the requested products.

With respect to claim 13, Geier et al discloses a teaching of accessing similar catalog number that the user inputs (col. 4, lines 29-38).

With respect to claim 14, the Examiner notes that the only difference between this claim and claim 14 is that this claim adds limitation of "including at least first and second entries for items each respectively corresponding to a different one of said first and second matching catalog items." As discussed in previous rejections, Dworkin lists out "all" products that meets the

Art Unit: 2411

information that the customer inputs. Dworkin further discloses that the orders that the customers wishes to make are transmitted to the suppliers or vendors (col. 2, lines 42-48). The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious for one having an ordinary skill in the art to include the feature in Dworkin to have more than one transaction including sending purchase orders as mentioned in King because it would have enhanced the customer satisfaction by letting the customers to request more one at a time. For the rest of the claim, the Examiner repeats the same rejection and reasoning for claim 11.

With respect to claims 15 and 16, Geier et al discloses a teaching of using catalog number for searching specific products (col. 3, lines 59-63). It would have been obvious for one having an ordinary skill in the art to utilize the teaching of catalog number because it would have provided easier search and retrieval for the requested products.

With respect to claim 17, Geier et al discloses a teaching of accessing similar catalog number that the user inputs (col. 4, lines 29-38).

With respect to claim 18, the Examiner notes that this claim recites substantially same scope as in claim 11, except that it adds “at least two” purchase orders as opposed to “at least one” in claim 11. Although King et al does not specifically discloses the number of purchase orders generated, the Examiner asserts that it at least discloses it implicitly since there would have been more than one supplier that it would have obvious to include a feature that generates more than one purchase orders for the customer’s convenience. For the rest of the claim, the Examiner repeats the same rejection and reasoning as in claim 11.

Art Unit: 2411

With respect to claims 19 and 20, Geier et al discloses a teaching of using catalog number for searching specific products (col. 3, lines 59-63). It would have been obvious for one having an ordinary skill in the art to utilize the teaching of catalog number because it would have provided easier search and retrieval for the requested products.

With respect to claim 21, Geier et al discloses a teaching of accessing similar catalog number that the user inputs (col. 4, lines 29-38).

With respect to claim 22, the Examiner asserts that this claim merely recites claim 1 twice except that it waits until both items are processed for selecting matching catalog items before purchase orders are processed. The Examiner asserts that King discloses it at least implicitly because the abstract discloses that "requisitions are then processed through the customer's procurement system and transmitted electronically as purchase orders to Suppliers." In other words, purchase orders, which is in plural, are processed as a last step of the system.

With respect to claim 23, Geier et al discloses a teaching of using catalog number for searching specific products (col. 3, lines 59-63). It would have been obvious for one having an ordinary skill in the art to utilize the teaching of catalog number because it would have provided easier search and retrieval for the requested products.

With respect to claim 24, Geier et al discloses a teaching of accessing similar catalog number that the user inputs (col. 4, lines 29-38).

With respect to claim 25, the Examiner notes that it is substantially same as claim 22, except the last limitation which recites means for processing said requisition to generate at least

Art Unit: 2411

one purchase order.... The Examiner asserts that King at least discloses it implicitly since it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art to include the limitation as recited in claim 25 because it would not have been necessary to prepare more than one purchase order if the customer was buying from one vendor even if there were more than one item or product.

With respect to claim 26, Geier et al discloses a teaching of using catalog number for searching specific products (col. 3, lines 59-63). It would have been obvious for one having an ordinary skill in the art to utilize the teaching of catalog number because it would have provided easier search and retrieval for the requested products.

With respect to claim 27, the Examiner notes that this claim is substantially same as claim 25, except the means for generating a order list and means for building a requisition from it. Geier discloses a order list generated in Appendix IV in col 11 and 12. It would have been obvious for one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time of claimed invention was made to include a order list as a confirmation purpose. Furthermore, the Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious for one having an ordinary skill in the art to use the order list as a shopping cart in a grocery store because it would have enhanced the customer satisfaction by providing a system that the customer could wait until he or she finishes shopping before send the finalized orders to the vendors.

With respect to claim 28, Geier et al discloses a teaching of using catalog number for searching specific products (col. 3, lines 59-63). It would have been obvious for one having an

Art Unit: 2411

ordinary skill in the art to utilize the teaching of catalog number because it would have provided easier search and retrieval for the requested products.

With respect to claim 29, Geier et al discloses a teaching of accessing similar catalog number that the user inputs (col. 4, lines 29-38).

With respect to claim 30, the Examiner notes that this claim recites substantially same subject matter as in claim 18. The Examiner repeats the same rejection and reasoning as discussed in claim 18.

With respect to claim 31, King discloses a system which facilitates the user in electronically ordering items from suppliers. More specifically, it discloses a teaching of maintaining a catalog database of data, which includes a Public Catalog and a Private Catalog (col. 3, lines 41-58). Although King does not disclose a teaching of entering product information that at least partially describes at least one item... Dworkin discloses a system which assists a user in locating and purchasing goods or services by inputting minimum desired specifications for the products or service (col. 2, line 11-18). It would have been obvious for one having an ordinary skill in the art to include the foregoing feature in Dworkin to provide services for broader range of customers because it would have been very difficult for the customers to know all the different brands in the market. King discloses a teaching of Requester which initiates the requisition by accessing the Public or Private Catalog to search for the item of interest. Although King does not disclose a teaching of hit list, Dworkin discloses a teaching of displaying a list which satisfies the customer request (col. 2, lines 14-19). Furthermore, Geier discloses a order list generated in

Art Unit: 2411

Appendix IV in col 11 and 12. It would have been obvious for one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time of claimed invention was made to include a order list as a confirmation purpose. Furthermore, the Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious for one having an ordinary skill in the art to use the order list as a shopping cart in a grocery store because it would have enhanced the customer satisfaction by providing a system that the customer could wait until he or she finishes shopping before send the finalized orders to the vendors. Although it discloses the means for building a requisition, it does not explicitly discloses what data that the requisition includes. Geiger et al, however, discloses a teaching of using catalog number or partial catalog number for ordering goods or services (abs.) and King further discloses a feature of prefilling the required field of the requisition after the searching for the requests (col. 5, lines 42-46). The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art to use catalog number for identifying purposes because the numbers are neutral in terms of the product type that it provides the simplest way for identifying different products. As for the last limitation of the claim 1, King discloses a teaching of sending purchase order send electronically. Although it does not specifically discloses a means for generating a purchase order, the Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to include a means for generating a purchase order if it includes a means for sending the purchase order electronically.

With respect to claim 32, Geier et al discloses a teaching of using catalog number for searching specific products (col. 3, lines 59-63). It would have been obvious for one having an

Art Unit: 2411

ordinary skill in the art to utilize the teaching of catalog number because it would have provided easier search and retrieval for the requested products.

With respect to claim 33, Geier et al discloses a teaching of accessing similar catalog number that the user inputs (col. 4, lines 29-38).

With respect to claim 34, the Examiner notes that this claim recites substantially same subject matter as in claim 1. The Examiner repeats the same rejection and reasoning as in claim 1.

With respect to claim 35, Geier et al discloses a teaching of using catalog number for searching specific products (col. 3, lines 59-63). It would have been obvious for one having an ordinary skill in the art to utilize the teaching of catalog number because it would have provided easier search and retrieval for the requested products.

With respect to claim 36, Geier et al discloses a teaching of accessing similar catalog number that the user inputs (col. 4, lines 29-38).

With respect to claim 37, the Examiner notes that this claim recites substantially the same subject matter as in claim 4. The Examiner repeats the same rejection and reasoning as in claim 4.

With respect to claim 38, the Examiner notes that this claim recites substantially the same subject matter as in claim 11. The Examiner repeats the same rejection and reasoning as in claim 11.

With respect to claim 39, King discloses a electronic catalog and a requisition system by using computers. King discloses a system which facilitates the user in electronically ordering items from suppliers. More specifically, it discloses a teaching of maintaining a catalog database

Art Unit: 2411

of data, which includes a Public Catalog and a Private Catalog (col. 3, lines 41-58). Although King does not disclose a teaching of entering product information that at least partially describes at least one item... Dworkin discloses a system which assists a user in locating and purchasing goods or services by inputting minimum desired specifications for the products or service (col. 2, line 11-18). It would have been obvious for one having an ordinary skill in the art to include the foregoing feature in Dworkin to provide services for broader range of customers because it would have been very difficult for the customers to know all the different brands in the market. Furthermore, King discloses a teaching of Requester which initiates the requisition by accessing the Public or Private Catalog to search for the item of interest. Although it discloses the means for building a requisition, it does not explicitly discloses what data that the requisition includes. Geiger et al, however, discloses a teaching of using catalog number or partial catalog number for ordering goods or services (abs.) and King further discloses a feature of prefilling the required field of the requisition after the searching for the requests (col. 5, lines 42-46). The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art to use catalog number for identifying purposes because the numbers are neural in terms of the product type that it provides the simplest way for identifying different products. As for the last limitation of the claim 1, King discloses a teaching of sending purchase order send electronically. Although it does not specifically discloses a means for generating a purchase order, the Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to include a means for generating a purchase order if it includes a means for sending the purchase order electronically.

Art Unit: 2411

With respect to claim 40-78, the Examiner notes that they recite the same subject matter recited in claims 1-39, except that they are in method claim language as opposed to apparatus claim language. Accordingly, the Examiner repeats the same rejection and reasoning as discussed in the above.

Conclusion

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the Examiner should be directed to Junghoon Kenneth Oh whose number is (703) 305-4645, or Gail Hayes whose number is (703) 305-9711.

Any inquiry of a general nature relating to the status of this applications should be directed to the Group receptionist whose number is (703) 305-3900.

Information associated with this application may be submitted by facsimile on (703) 308-5356.

JKO


GAIL O. HAYES
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
GROUP 2400

November 7, 1997